



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,403	09/17/2003	Karen Theel	021756-002300US	8953
51206 7590 11/09/2009 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER ARAQUE JR, GERARDO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3689				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,403

Applicant(s)

THEEL ET AL.

Examiner

Gerardo Araque Jr.

Art Unit

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

2. **Claim 10** is objected to because of the following informalities: **the term "devic" should be "device" in line 2 of the claim 10.** Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 1 – 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
5. The applicant has amended the claims to include the following limitations:
 - a first client computer;
 - a first host computer;
 - a first set of graphical user interfaces;

forwarding information between the plurality of computers as well as using more than one computer to perform the claimed invention, i.e. first and second client computers and first and second host computers;

a workflow participant; and

a second set of graphical user interfaces;

First, after reviewing the specification the Examiner asserts that there is not support for a plurality of computer communicating with one another in order to perform the claimed invention. Although, the specification does disclose a network (**Page 13 – 14 ¶ 68 – 69**) the specification has not disclosed the network to the level in which a plurality of computers are communicating and forwarding information between one another. More specifically, the specification fails to disclose the use of client and host computers and their associated responsibilities, as disclosed in the current claims. It is asserted that the specification has only disclosed a network to the extent of simply defining what a network is, which one of ordinary skill and skilled in the art of computing and networking would have fully already understood. Simply stating that the network and the software modules may be executed by more than one processor is not equivalent to the limitations set forth in the current set of claims (**Page 14 ¶ 72**). That is to say, disclosing/infering that a network contains more than one computer and that the software modules may be executed by more than one processor is not the same as claiming the responsibilities/actions performed by the first and second client computers and the first and second host computers.

Second, the specification has also failed to disclose more than one set of interfaces, i.e. a first set of interfaces and a second set of interfaces. Although, a plurality of interfaces are discussed in the specification and that multiple stages may be completed in parallel is not equivalent to claiming sets of interfaces (**Page 7 ¶ 37**). The Examiner asserts that the extent in which the specification has discussed how the interfaces are being provided to the user is not to the level of providing sets of interfaces. That is to say, the specification has only disclosed that the interfaces are provided to a user either in a sequential manner or in parallel. In other words, it is asserted that the interfaces can be provided/displayed to a user one interface at a time or provided/displayed to a user all at the same time. However, with that said, the Examiner asserts that although multiple interfaces can be displayed to the user at one time there is no disclosure to indicate that the multiple interfaces are being "filled-in" at the same time. Regardless, the Examiner asserts that there is only one set of interfaces for each stability study and that the interfaces can be provided/displayed to a user either one interface at a time or more than one interface at a time.

Third, the Examiner further asserts that the specification has failed to disclose any discussion of a workflow participant. At best, it is being understood by the Examiner that there is only one user that is performing the invention at a time and that there is no disclosure of "inviting" a participant to join in on inputting the necessary information for the stability study. It is asserted that a user in setting up the parameters into the interfaces, saving those parameters, inputting the values of those parameters into the interface, which the Examiner assumes can be before, during, or after

observing the stability study, and storing all relevant information associated with the stability study. At no point in the specification is there any disclosure of a workflow participant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 1 – 12 and 27 – 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. In regards to **claims 1, 27, and 34**, the Examiner asserts that the term "enable" is not a positive recitation for the intended action that the applicant wants the user to carry out. The Examiner asserts that "enabling" a user to perform a specified task is no different than "allowing" a user to perform the specified task.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 12, 27 – 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goodwin et al. (US PGPub 2002/0023057A1)**.
11. In regards to **claims 1, 27, and 34**, **Goodwin** discloses a computer-implemented method and a tangible computer readable medium storing a set of instructions for

managing stability studies that when executed by a processor of a data processing system, the method and computer readable medium comprising:

forwarding, to a first client computer, information configured to display a first interface in a first set of one or more graphical user interfaces that enables users of the first client computer to create an event by specifying requirements that need to be fulfilled for the event (**Figures 8A, 8B wherein a first interface is provided that enables a user to begin a process by specifying what it is that they would like to perform. moreover, by selecting which event that they wish to perform the user has specified which requirements are needed in order to fulfill the event, such as registration information. further still, the programmer of the interfaces also determines and programs which information is necessary in order to advance through the wizard for each type of possible event; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s);**

receiving, at a first host computer, first input specified by a user of the first client computer via the first interface in the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces, the first input indicative of a set of requirements for at least one event (**Figures 8A, 8B wherein the user is required to input their selection in order to proceed; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));**

forwarding, to the first client computer, information configured to display a second interface in the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces that enables the users of the first client computer to create workflows associated with stages of an event, a workflow including information configured to prompt a workflow participant to perform one or more actions that need to be taken during a stage associated with as event in order to fulfill requirements specified for the event **(Figures 9A – 9N; 10B – 10O; 11C – 11L wherein the user is prompted to enter required information pertaining to their selection of their desired process in order to fulfill the requirements specified by the process/selection; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));**

receiving, at the first host computer, input specified by the user of the first client computer via the second interface in the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces, the second input indicative of a set of workflows associated with a plurality of stages of the at least one event, each workflow in the set of workflows specifying a set of actions that need to be taken during each stage in the plurality of stages of the at least one event **(Figures 9A – 9N; 10B – 10O; 11C – 11L wherein the user inputs the prompted required information, wherein each prompts specifies the set of actions that are needed; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information**

is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));

forwarding, to the first client computer, information configured to display a third interface in the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces that enable the users of the first client computer to specify business rules for the event (see at least Figures 9A – 9N; 10A – 10O; 11A – 11L wherein business rules are provided in order to allow the interfaces to carryout their function and wherein the user is also allowed to enter their business rules for the interface to carry out; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));

receiving, at the first host computer, third input specified by the user via the third interface in the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces, the third input indicative of a set of business rules for the at least one event (see at least Figures 9A – 9N; 10A – 10O; 11A – 11L wherein the user inputs the required information; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));

generating, at a data processing device, a second set of one or more graphical user interfaces for the at least one event based on the set of requirements that need to be fulfilled for the at least one event, the set of workflows associated with the plurality of stages of the at least one event, and the set of business rules for the at least one event,

wherein the second set of one or more graphical user interfaces define the set of requirements for the at least one event (see at least Figures 8A – 8B; 9A – 9N; 10A – 10O; 11A – 11L wherein the plurality of interfaces are based on the requirements for carrying the selected process, the prompts associated with each stage of the process, and the business rules to carry out the selected process; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));

forwarding, to a second client computer, information configured to display one or more interfaces in the second set of graphical user interfaces (Figures 8A – 8B; 9A – 9N; 10A – 10O; 11A – 11L wherein the plurality of interfaces are displayed; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s));

receiving, a second host computer, information specified by one or more users of the second client computer via the one or more interfaces in the second set of interfaces, the received information for fulfilling the requirements of the at least one event (Figures 8A – 8B; 9A – 9N; 10A – 10O; 11A – 11 wherein the user inputs the necessary information in order to fulfill the requirements pertaining to the selected process; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information

is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s)); and

validating, by the second host computer, the received information against the set of business rules for the at least one event to determine whether the information is acceptable (see at least Figures 8B; 9C; 9J; 10I; 10L; 11J; 12A # 1206-1212 wherein the inputted information is validated against the business rules that the interfaces abide by in order to determine whether the inputted information is acceptable; see also Figure 1, Figure 28 – 31G; Page 1 ¶ 8, 10 wherein an online GUI system using a wizard format is disclosed and wherein the information is being communicated/transmitted between a client computer(s) and a host computer(s)).

Regarding the limitation that the interfaces are directed towards a stability study, the Examiner asserts this to be non-functional descriptive subject matter. Although, the claims are directed to an interface for the express purpose of cataloging/inputting information regarding a stability study it is asserted that the type of information carries no functional/patentable weight on how the method is carried out. That is to say, the type of data that is being inputted does not affect how the method is carried out or how the interfaces interact with the user.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the claimed invention is merely providing a user with a plurality of interfaces that allow a user to input the requested information through the use of prompts and determine whether the inputted/submitted information is valid. The type of data that is being inputted and/or requested adds little, if anything, to the steps of the method as currently claim, that is to

say providing an interactive interface that validates the inputted/submitted data does not serve as a limitation on the claims to distinguish it over the prior art.

Currently the steps of the method that include the data regarding the stability study are non-functional descriptive subject matter, since the steps are drawn to merely the gathering of information/data. In other words, the fact that the data being gathered relates to a stability study is non-functional since this information is not being used for any analysis, calculation, or determination, nor is it being used in a manner that requires any sort of processing that is specific to a stability study. As claimed, the steps of the invention would be performed the same regardless of what the inputted/submitted information is directed to.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate stability study information into the interface as disclosed by **Goodwin** since it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the claimed invention is providing nothing more than a graphical user interface/wizard and that it would not have been uniquely challenging or difficult to adjust the parameters (requested data) to suit the need of the user, in this case inputting information regarding a stability study.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized this since the results would have been predictable and the claimed invention does not distinguish how inputting information regarding a stability study is any different than inputting the information disclosed by **Goodwin**. In other words, the fact that the data is in regards to

a stability study is non-functional since it is not being used in a manner that requires sufficient processing that is specific to a stability study.

12. In regards to **claims 2 and 28**, **Goodwin** discloses further comprising if the information specified by the one or more users of the second client computer is acceptable, storing the information specified by the one or more users of the second client computer using a storage device (**see at least Page 3 ¶ 61 – 62 wherein the invention is performed using a computer, which contains a storage device, and wherein the inputted information, such as a user's login information, is stored in the system. Moreover, it is also asserted that it is obvious that more than one user is allowed to perform the claimed invention on any number of computers, as long as the computers are able to connect to the Internet/network**).

13. In regards to **claims 3 and 29**, **Goodwin** discloses further comprising:
determining, by the data processing device, whether the set of requirements for the at least one stability study have been completed (**see at least Page 8 ¶ 114 wherein the process does not proceed onto the next step until all of the requirements are completed**); and

if the set of requirements have not been completed requesting, using the data processing device, additional information for the requirements in the set of requirements that have not been completed (**see at least Page 8 ¶ 114; Figures 9J; 10K; 17E; 17F; 22A; wherein an interface is provided indicating that additional information is required before proceeding**).

14. In regards to **claims 4 and 30**, **Goodwin** discloses further comprising:
determining, by the data processing device, whether approval from a user is needed for the information specified by the one or more users of the second client computer based on the set of workflows associated with the plurality of stages of the at least one stability study (**Figures 9D; 9E; 9I; 9L – 9N; 10C; 10E; 10F; 10I; 11L wherein determining whether approval from a user is needed based on the prompts**).

15. In regards to **claims 5 and 31**, **Goodwin** discloses further comprising: receiving, at the data processing device, an indication of approval for the information specified by the one or more users of the second client computer; and storing the indication using a storage device (**Figures 9D; 9E; 9I; 9L – 9N; 10C; 10E; 10F; 10I; 10L; 11L; wherein the user inputs their approval; see also at least Page 3 ¶ 61 – 62 wherein the invention is performed using a computer, which contains a storage device, and wherein the inputted information, such as a user's login information, is stored in the system wherein**).

16. In regards to **claims 7 and 33**, **Goodwin** discloses further comprising:
receiving, at the data processing device, an indication of disapproval for the information specified by the one or more users of the second client computer (**see at least Figures 7A – 7D wherein a user provides an indication to cancel the selected process**);

determining, by the data processing device, requirements that need to be completed for approval (**see at least Figures 7A – 7D wherein information that has yet to be entered will require the user to input the required information before**

proceeding, as discussed above, while information that has already been inputted in stored in the system); and

requesting, using the data processing device, that the determined requirements be completed for approval **(see at least Figures 7A – 7D; Figures 9D; 9E; 9I; 9L – 9N; 10C; 10E; 10F; 10I; 11L wherein determining whether approval from a user is needed based on the prompts).**

17. In regards to **claim 8, Goodwin** discloses wherein the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces include an interface for a stage in the plurality of stages in the at least one stability study **(Figures 9A – 9N; 10B – 10O; 11C – 11L wherein a plurality of interfaces are provided for each stage of the process).**

18. In regards to **claim 9, Goodwin** discloses wherein the plurality of stages comprise at least two of a stability study setup criteria, stability study planning criteria, initial sampling and testing criteria, stability study launch criteria, stability study testing criteria, and stability study evaluation criteria **(see at least Figures 11C – 11G; 11I; 11J; 11K wherein a plurality of stages are providing for planning, sampling, testing, and evaluating are provided).**

19. In regards to **claim 10, Goodwin** discloses further comprising outputting, from the data processing device, information summarizing the at least one stability study **(see at least Figure 10O; 11L; 13C13J; 13K; wherein the summary of the process is displayed to the user).**

20. In regards to **claims 11 – 12, Goodwin**, as discussed above, fails to disclose inputting information regarding the at least one stability study. However, as discussed

above, it is asserted that although the information is in regards to a stability study the inputted information and the fact that the interfaces are for a case study are non-functional descriptive subject matter.

Although, **Goodwin** does not disclose:

further comprising determining, by the data processing device, a result of the first stability study; and

wherein the result (stability study result) is inputted by a user;

it is still asserted that the inputted information is non-functional descriptive subject matter. As discussed above, the Examiner asserts that the invention is not directed towards a stability study, but the use of interfaces as a means of inputting and storing information. Again, the steps of the method that include data regarding a stability study are merely non-functional descriptive subject matter, since the steps are drawn to merely the gathering of information/data and the data being gathered is not being used by a particular machine to calculate or make any sort of determination, nor is it being used in a manner that requires any sort of processing that is specific to a stability study. As claimed, the steps of the invention would be performed the same regardless of what the inputted/submitted information is directed to so long as the interface is capable of receiving, validating, and storing information, which is, indeed, disclosed by **Goodwin**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate stability study information into the interface as disclosed by **Goodwin** since it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art that the claimed invention is providing nothing more than a graphical user interface/wizard and that it would not have been uniquely challenging or difficult to adjust the parameters (requested data) to suit the need of the user, in this case inputting information regarding a stability study. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized this since the results would have been predictable and the claimed invention does not distinguish how inputting information regarding a stability study is any different than inputting the information disclosed by **Goodwin**. In other words, the fact that the data is in regards to a stability study is non-functional since it is not being used in a manner that requires sufficient processing that is specific to a stability study.

21. In regards to **claim 35**, **Goodwin** discloses wherein the first set of one or more graphical user interfaces is further configured to enable the user to create a specification for a first stability study as an overlay using a specification for a second stability study as a base (**see at least Figures 7D; 10M; 19B – 19F; 31C wherein previously stored information from a previous process is stored and can be used/updated for a later process**).

22. **Claims 6 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goodwin et al. (US PGPub 2002/0023057A1)** in view of **Lawrence D. Casiraya (Industries can issue digital certificates to hike security)**.

23. In regards to **claims 6 and 32**, **Goodwin** is discussed above and further discloses inputting personal identification information, such as credit card information, authority information, and social security numbers. As it can be seen it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that **Goodwin** provides sufficient teaching to allow one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize that **Goodwin** does, indeed, disclose various means of user authentication and security.

However, **Goodwin** fails to disclose the specific user authentication and security: wherein the indication comprises at least one of an electronic signature and captured signature.

However, **Casiraya** discloses that the use of digital signatures is an old and well known concept in increasing security and allows for the issuing of cross-certification among industries and be interoperable. Since each individual element and its function are known in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself, that is in the substitution of personal identification information, such as credit card information, authority information, and social security numbers of **Goodwin** for the digital signatures of **Casiraya**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious and would not be uniquely challenging or difficult for one having ordinary skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed **August 11, 2009** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph

25. Due to the provided amendments the rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, of the previous Office Action have been withdrawn. However, new rejections have been provided, some of which are similar in nature to the previous rejections. It is asserted that the rejections which are similar in nature to the previous set of rejections have been edited to better reflect the current amended claims.

Rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

26. With the exception of the 112, second paragraph, rejection directed towards the term "enable" all previous rejections have been withdrawn. Regarding the rejection that has been maintained the Examiner asserts that the rejection is still proper since the claims have not been amended to overcome the rejection.

Rejection under 35 USC 101

27. Rejections under 35 USC 101 have been withdrawn due to the provided amendments.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

28. The Examiner asserts that the applicant's arguments are directed towards non-functional descriptive subject matter. The Examiner asserts that the limitations were not simply disregarded and not considered. On the contrary, the Examiner fully considered the limitations that claimed that the method is directed to a stability study and it was

concluded, as discussed in detail above, that the mere fact that the method is directed towards a stability study is nothing more than non-functional descriptive subject matter.

As discussed, what the event is, i.e. a stability study, does not provide any further limitations to how the method is carried out. It is asserted that the claims have not provided any limitations to discuss the importance of performing a stability study. As can be seen in the claims, there are no steps or limitations that indicate that the method of data entry would be affected because the method is directed towards a stability study. There are no steps or limitations that are specifically designed for a stability study, such as, but not limited to, performing the actual stability study and/or an analysis of the results of the stability study in order to arrive at some conclusion.

It is asserted by the Examiner that the claimed invention is nothing more than simple data entry through the use of a wizard. More specifically, the claimed invention is simply a semi-automated process of data entry using a wizard setup. It is asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the concept of providing parameters to a user for a study, requiring the user fill in the parameters, and storing the information is old and well known. The Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that such practices are extremely old and well known and are part of many educational curriculums.

For example, the Examiner asserts that it is old and well known for elementary school, middle school, high school, and university students to receive a worksheet for some type of lab they are conducting (such as, but not limited to, observing a caterpillar becoming a butterfly, observing the effects of vinegar on an egg, kinetic/potential energy

experiments, electromagnetic experiments, etc.) and require the student to fill in the missing/required information/parameters (time span, force, observations, etc.). In other words, the claimed invention is nothing more than substituting the paper worksheet for an electronic worksheet (interface), which is also old and well known and practiced by many universities, such as physics classes.

As a result, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide an electronic logging method using a wizard interface system (wherein the interface is nothing more than (i.e. equivalent to) an electronic worksheet, since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

Therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejection that the claimed method of inputting information for a stability study is nothing more than non-functional descriptive subject matter since the event, i.e. the stability study, does not affect how a user would receive predetermined parameters provided in an interface, requiring the user to input the required predetermined parameters, and storing all the information associated with the event.

With that said, the Examiner asserts that **Goodwin** provides a system and method wherein interfaces containing parameters for a specific event are provided, wherein the parameters are obviously parameters that were programmed into the interface by a user. The interfaces further provide a user to further limit what interfaces should be displayed and informing the system to only display a set of interfaces of a

plurality of interfaces based on the inputted data. For example, the interface prompts/requires (workflow) the user to indicate whether the user would like to register with stamps.com, indicate that the user is already registered with stamps.com, or cancel. Based on the inputted information the interface will then continue onto a separate interface and continue with the registration process or sign in and complete the user's request.

Therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejection since, at least, **Goodwin** discloses a system and method wherein a plurality of interfaces are provided by a user wherein the interfaces require user input and stores the inputted information. It is further asserted that **Goodwin** discloses that the user is allowed to generate/create specific interfaces in order to meet their specific requirements and that only specific interfaces of a plurality of interfaces will be displayed. **Goodwin** further discloses that previously entered information that has already been stored can later be recalled for use in later and separate sessions using a different or same set of interfaces.

Conclusion

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerardo Araque Jr. whose telephone number is (571)272-3747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on (571) 272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 3689
11/5/09

/Dennis Ruhl/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689